## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/615,816	07/09/2003	Graham Roger Jones	YAMAP0880US	1433	
	7590 09/06/200	EXAMINER			
MARK D. SARALINO (GENERAL) RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP 1621 EUCLID AVENUE, NINETEENTH FLOOR CLEVELAND, OH 44115-2191			. WONG, ALLEN C		
			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
,	,		2621		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/06/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/615,816	JONES ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
Allen Wong	2621

	Allen Wong		2621	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sh	neet with the co	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>10 August 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS				
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or this application, applicant must timely file one of the fol places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a I (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comfollowing time periods:</li> </ol>	on the same day as fi lowing replies: (1) an Notice of Appeal (with	iling a Notice of amendment, af appeal fee) in o	Appeal. To avoid ab fidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 C	ence, which CFR 41.31; or
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ace event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07	than SIX MONTHS from t b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b (f).	the mailing date of b) WHEN THE FIF	the final rejection. RST REPLY WAS FILE!	OWT NIHTIW C
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mon earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding a statutory period for reply o	mount of the fee. I	The appropriate extensio final Office action; or (2)	n fee under 37 as set forth in (b)
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in corn of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	extension thereof (37	CFR 41.37(e))	, to avoid dismissal d	of the appeal.
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection	n but prior to the date	e of filing a brief	will not be entered	because
(a) They raise new issues that would require further (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE be (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bappeal; and/or	consideration and/or s low);	search (see NO	TE below);	٠
(d) They present additional claims without canceling  NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a	-	ber of finally rej	ected claims.	
<ul> <li>4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1</li> <li>5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejections</li> <li>6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be</li> </ul>	.121. See attached N (s):			
the non-allowable claim(s).			**************************************	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a how the new or amended claims would be rejected is p The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-47. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			II be entered and an	explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filinentered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necess</li> </ol>	o overcome <u>all</u> rejection ary and was not earlie	ons under appea er presented. S	al and/or appellant fa ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a 1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanal REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	tion of the status of th	e claims after e	ntry is below or attac	ched.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered See Continuation Sheet.	but does NOT place ti	he application ir	n condition for allowa	ince because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s	s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper	r No(s)	M 1 -	
13. Other:				
		O	Allen Wong Primary Examiner	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: although applicant's arguments are understood, however, they are not deemed persuasive. Regarding pages 2-9 of applicant's remarks, applicant states that Woodgate does not disclose the autostereoscopic display including a transreflective spatial light modulator as recited in claims 1 and 24. The examiner respectfully disagrees. In figure 1, Woodgate discloses element 5 that comprises the details of the spatial light modulator 4 in that there is an arrangement of plural preventive transmission elements 5a and 5b for substantially preventing the transmission of light through the at least one first region of the modulator to an autostereoscopic viewing region of the display. In figure 1, Woodgate discloses that element 7 controls the transreflective spatial light modulator within the arrangement as shown in element 5. Thus, Woodgate discloses the control of a transreflective spatial light modulator. Also, in column 4, lines 5-13, Woodgate discloses the polarization means for polarizing certain light frequencies from entering or transmitting through in that these certain light frequencies are reflected back. Polarization is conceptually known for letting some light frequencies pass through while at the same time, the light frequencies that do not pass through (ie. polarized) are reflected back. Woodgate discloses that the SLM (spatial light modulator) comprises polarization means for preventing or reflecting back the unwanted or blocked out light frequencies while letting or permitting the unblocked light frequencies. Thus, the concept of "transreflective" is disclosed in Woodgate's SLM (spatial light modulator). Therefore, Woodgate does teach the autostereoscopic display including a "transreflective spatial light modulator" as recited in claims 1 and 24. Dependent claims are rejected for at least similar reasons as set forth.